UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/039,036	01/04/2002	Nicholas P. Wilt	MSFT-0742/177739.1	2352

			EXAMINER
41505	7590	02/13/2006	ALI, SYED J

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)
ONE LIBERTY PLACE - 46TH FLOOR
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2195	

DATE MAILED: 02/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED <u>17 January 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

 a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

 b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

<u>NOTICE OF APPEAL</u>

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

<u>AMENDMENTS</u>

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because

 (a)☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

 (b)☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

 (c)☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

 (d)☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

 NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

 Claim(s) allowed: <u>None</u>.

 Claim(s) objected to: <u>None</u>.

 Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-23,27-49 and 52-74</u>.

 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>None</u>.

<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

<u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u>

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

13. ☐ Other: _____.

MENG-AL I...N
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNO...

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments center on the alleged lack of interchangeability between Anderson and Duruoz. Applicant alleges that Anderson has extensive requirements for implementing tasks that are not compatible with the teachings of Duruoz. First, it should be noted that the portion of Anderson cited by Applicant relates to the specifications of a DSP Task Unit, rather than the actual implementation of a DSP Task Unit. A closer reading of Anderson and Duruoz actually reveals that the references are very much "combinable." Anderson discusses creating tasks for a DSP to execute by way of a data structure stored in a linked list. The data structure includes the relevant variables or operands, input/output buffers, etc. needed for executing the task (col. 8 lines 24-29). DSP Task Units are created dynamically and organized in a linked list (col. 8 lines 24-26). However, Anderson notes that special steps are required for handling the stoage allocations associated with a Task Unit, suggesting a need for a mechanism that handles the allocation/deallocation of tasks. Duruoz provides such a mechanism in the form of a command buffer that also has the benefit of allowing tasks/commands to be received at the coprocessor so that the host processor can continue with other work while waiting for the coprocessor to complete the task. The command buffer is shown at Fig. 5 of Duruoz, and is disclosed as a data structure for storing commands. Thus, the command buffer supports a task or command unit in the form of a data structure, which is perfectly combinable with the DSP Task Unit object described by Anderson. Moreover, Duruoz shows that the data structure should include the necessary operands for executing the task, while Anderson teaches inclusion of the necessary "variables" as part of the DSP Task Unit. Since Anderson and Duruoz have been shown to be combinable, and Applicant presents no other arguments regarding the deficiency of the combination thereof, the claims stand rejected.